

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 9-16 are in the application.

§ 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 2-6, 9-13 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by “NewNet SMserver: Wireless Short Message Service Tutorial”, hereinafter “NewNet”.

Differences Between the Cited Art and the Claimed Invention

Representative claim 3 recites in relevant part:

3. A message router system for a server system that communicates with embedded devices over a data network, the router system comprising:

a router coupled to a message store;

a queue manager queuing messages from one or more server processes that are destined for a plurality of embedded devices, each of the messages being addressed to one of the embedded devices in the plurality of embedded devices with a unique identifier, *the unique identifier being independent of any communication protocol*;...

for each message, the router *transmitting the message* directly to the destination address of the embedded device over the data network *regardless of whether the embedded device is active on the data network*;...

The Applicants respectfully submit that NewNet does not implicitly or explicitly disclose the Applicants' claimed combination of *a unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol* and *transmitting a message to a destination address associated with an embedded device regardless of whether the embedded device is active on the data network*.

With regards to the *unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol*, the Examiner seems to not address this aspect of the claims in the Office Action. As noted in the Applicants' response filed on December 16, 2004 messages destined for embedded devices are queued along with the unique identifiers by a queue manager associated with a server system. The unique identifiers are used by the server system to look up destination addresses for

embedded devices that are to receive the messages. By queuing messages addressed associated with unique identifiers that are independent of any communication protocol and then translating the unique identifiers into destination addresses of the embedded devices, server processes can be implemented to communicate directly with individual devices unaware of the underlying communication protocols (e.g., SMTP, TCP/IP, etc). Thus, the present invention facilitates portability across different communication platforms.

NewNet does not disclose *unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol* that is associated with messages destined for embedded devices. This is because NewNet discusses the handling of messages at a high level and does not provide sufficient details that describe how the messages are addressed to the devices destined to receive the messages. The Examiner seems to believe that NewNet teaches the Applicants' claimed unique identifier at in the "Introduction" section on page 1, the "Signaling Elements" section on page 5 and the "Subscriber Services" section on page 6, however, these sections discuss mechanisms for transmitting "short" messages to and from wireless handsets but fail to provide sufficient detail as to how those messages are transmitted let alone whether the messages are addressed to embedded devices using a unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol.

With regards to *transmitting a message to the destination address associated with an embedded device regardless of whether the embedded device is active on the data network*, the Examiner seems to suggest that NewNet teaches this aspect of the Applicants' claimed invention in the "Signaling Elements" section on page 5. Specifically, the Examiner notes that NewNet describes a short message that is delivered to a mobile station whenever the mobile station is registered and that the outcome of the delivery comprises either success or failure.

As is well known in the art of wireless mobile communication, when a mobile station enters a network (e.g., due to roaming, being powered on, etc.) the mobile station registers with a visitor location register (VLR) or home location register (HLR) in the network. Registration makes the network aware of the mobile station as well as tells the network how to reach the mobile station. By knowing the mobile station's location, the network knows how to route traffic (e.g., messages) destined for the mobile station. If the mobile station is not registered with the network, the network is unaware of its presence and would not know how to route traffic destined for the mobile station to the mobile station. Thus, it would not make sense to transmit a

message to a mobile station that is not registered in the network because the network would not know how to route a message to the mobile station.

The Applicants, on the other hand, claim a message router system which transmits a message to a destination address associated with an embedded device regardless of whether the active device is active in the network. Here, since the message is sent to the embedded device's destination address, the network, using e.g., routing protocols, uses the destination address to determine how to route the message to the embedded device. See Fig. 2C and pages 17-18 of the Applicants' specification. Thus, the embedded device need not undergo registration and be active in the network in order for the system to attempt to route the message to the embedded device.

Because of the absence of *a unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol* and *transmitting a message to a destination address associated with an embedded device regardless of whether the embedded device is active on the data network* in NewNet, the Applicants respectfully submit that NewNet fails to render claims 2-6, 9-13 and 15-16 anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the above rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over NewNet.

Differences Between the Cited Art and the Claimed Invention

Claims 7 and 14 are dependent on independent claims 3 and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 7 and 14 contain the combination of *a unique identifier that is independent of any communication protocol* and *transmitting a message to a destination address associated with an embedded device regardless of whether the embedded device is active on the data network* which as noted above is not present in NewNet. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that NewNet fails to render claims 7 and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and the Applicants respectfully request that the above rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Michael J. Badzinski
Michael J. Badzinski
Registration No. 51,425
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 2/22/06